

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 10, 12 and 17 have been amended. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kimball (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0034646), hereafter “Kimball,” in view of Ohsugi *et al.*, ‘A Recommendation System for Software Function Discovery’ APSEC 2002, pages 248-257, hereafter “Ohsugi,” and further in view of Robinson (U.S. Patent No. 5,918,014), hereafter “Robinson,”

Applicant asserts that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 10, 12 and 17, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest that members of the group for which the use count is recorded have similar responsibilities within an organization. In contrast, none of the references cited by the Office describe the ability to determine usage of and to modify an interface based on members in a group that have similar responsibilities. For example, modifications of the interface may differ between a group of users having software developers and one having secretaries due to different usage patterns between the two. None of

the references cited by the Office take this into account. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 4, 2009

/Hunter E. Webb/
Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)